

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 04:30:29 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #149
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 18 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 149

Today's Topics:

 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity) (2 msgs)
 Morse et cetera...
 No-Code Stupidity (2 msgs)
 Type certification

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 02:29:14 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!
r_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May18.002828.27730@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>Ahh, but we don't have rude and offensive behavior on those bands
>occupied by the Morsely impaired? And on 75 and 20 meters we don't
>have amateurs that "crank their linears and walk over the other
>stations to piss people off"? You must listen to a different segment
>of the band than I do (or than the FCC does based upon recent NALs.)
>
>Also my comment about DX chasers (which I heistantly lump myself into)
>and testers was meant as an analogy and not specifically about
>power. At times they exhibit as equally rude and obnoxious behavior as
>anything I've heard on CB. Listen to the name calling that goes on in

>a pileup, or the intentional tuning up on top of the DX station, or
>the calling out of turn or on top of the current station, or the
>station calling CQ contest on an occupied frequency simply because the
>QSO wasn't contest related. In chasing DX over the last 8 months,
>I've seen some of the most obnoxious and rude behavior imaginable.
>Almost equal to that in this news grou. ;-) As a whole it is
>debatable how much different amateurs are than others.

Well, I'm sure you're a seasoned pro at this, and you've "seen it all", but if you are trying to tell me that the INTENTIONAL name calling, overpowering, and overall rudeness on the HF bands are equal to 11 meters, you've got to be kidding me. I was a CBer for a while before I got my ticket, so I can say that I've seen both ends of the spectrum. In 11 meters, I've witnessed people keying up intentionally to prevent others from using that channel. I heard challenges to fights. I've seen "fox hunts" where CBers try to locate somebodys signal, and stick pins in their coax. Never once have I seen that such actions the HF bands. Sure there's the occasional pileup, and people can be jerks, but nothing like 11 meters. I'm sorry, but I don't buy it.

>>Let's face it, there's a little bit of a difference between talking to
>>your buddy accross the street, and working a rare station in some
>>obscure part of the world. Please reconsider your argument.
>
>For me there is a difference because I like to chase DX. To a non-DXer
>they're the same. Certainly neither one is more important than the
>other. Each one to their own.

Well Todd, once again, you missed the point. What you're saying is that to a non-DXer, the distance factor is the same. Then for a non DXer, it's O.K. to use 1k watts to talk to his friend across the street. I'm SURE the FCC would approve of that.

Have a nice day!

Ron Fussell ***** Apply only when necessary...
N1HIB ***** ... never too much, just enough

----- all flames welcome -----
 | r_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu |

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 10:13:46 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

r_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

>spectrum. In 11 meters, I've witnessed people keying up intentionally
>to prevent others from using that channel. I heard challenges to
>fights. I've seen "fox hunts" where CBers try to locate somebody's signal,
>and stick pins in their coax. Never once have I seen that such actions
>the HF bands. Sure there's the occasional pileup, and people can be

You've never seen someone key up on the HF bands to prevent others from
using that frequency? What bands do you operate on? In 8 months of
operating on the HF bands I've heard it plenty of times. Wonderful thing
about anecdotal evidence, your's may be different than mine. ;-)

> Well Todd, once again, you missed the point. What you're saying is
>that to a non-DXer, the distance factor is the same. Then for a non
>DXer, it's O.K. to use 1k watts to talk to his friend across the
>street. I'm SURE the FCC would approve of that.

Excuse me, what point did I miss? The point was never about power, the
point was about rude and obnoxious behavior. I used an example of a CBer
keying up his linear to obliterate a nearby conversation. But since that
never happens on the amateur bands according to you, I chose the equally
obnoxious behaviors that certain Morsely impaired individuals in the
amateur ranks demonstrate on a regular basis. It's pretty clear that the
CBers don't have a lock on obnoxious behavior. And it's equally as clear
that the Morse code requirement doesn't filter out obnoxious arrogant
operators as some in this thread would like to imply.

As someone else suggested, why not get the FCC records on NALs and see what
the percentage of each class of license has been issued NALs. Based upon
what I've seen written up in QST over the last year or two, novices and
technicians which make up over half the amateur population account for far
less than half the NALs issued to licensed amateurs.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 01:08:08 CDT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!
unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> Hahahahahaha, can I quote you on that? You're suggesting that learning

Sure, Todd, quote away. I think you realize, by now, that I can substantiate my arguments with documentation.

Have a nice day.

--Robert

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 02:28:18 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

r_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

> Well, that one is easy, CBers crank their linears and walk over the
> other stations to piss people off. Generally, this is considered rude
> and offensive. On the other hand, when the bands are in poor shape,
> or when a contest is taking place, the extra power is needed to get
> the job done. Of course there are the unfortunate who are limited

[to wit, remainder of pointless rebuttal deleted]

Ahh, but we don't have rude and offensive behavior on those bands occupied by the Morsely impaired? And on 75 and 20 meters we don't have amateurs that "crank their linears and walk over the other stations to piss people off"? You must listen to a different segment of the band than I do (or than the FCC does based upon recent NALs.)

Also my comment about DX chasers (which I heistantly lump myself into) and testers was meant as an analogy and not specifically about power. At times they exhibit as equally rude and obnoxious behavior as anything I've heard on CB. Listen to the name calling that goes on in a pileup, or the intentional tuning up on top of the DX station, or the calling out of turn or on top of the current station, or the station calling CQ contest on an occupied frequency simply because the QSO wasn't contest related. In chasing DX over the last 8 months, I've seen some of the most obnoxious and rude behavior imaginable. Almost equal to that in this news grou. ;-) As a whole it is debatable how much different amateurs are than others.

>Let's face it, there's a little bit of a difference between talking to
>your buddy accross the street, and working a rare staition in some
>obscure part of the world. Please reconsider your argument.

For me there is a difference because I like to chase DX. To a non-DXer
they're the same. Certainly neither one is more important than the
other. Each one to their own.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 18 May 93 06:49:58 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!metro!mippet.ci.com.au!eram!dave@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May17.195817.11106@oz.plymouth.edu>,
r_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

| Code requirements are great to keep our bands from turning into 11 meters.

So what's this garbage heard on 14.313 then?

--
Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC PGP 2.2
dave@esi.COM.AU ...munari!esi.COM.AU!dave available

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 01:42:36 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!calvin!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Type certification
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C76unK.CE@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:

>Hello all,

>

>I'm interested in the requirements for type certification.

The generic answer is to obtain a copy of the Code Of Federal Rules, Chapter
47 (aka 47 CFR). You'll find a copy at the Government Documents Library
at UC Davis. There are a number of "levels" of inspection, from checking
model calculations (the least stringent) to testing every device off the

assembly line (the most stringent).

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 18 May 1993 01:13:48 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!chnews!joshua!jbromley@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Z4go4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1t8kjq\$1vu@chnews.intel.com>,
<1993May17.214135.850@leland.Stanford.EDU>p
Subject : Re: Morse et cetera...

In article <1993May17.214135.850@leland.Stanford.EDU>
paulf@calvin.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>In article <1t8kjq\$1vu@chnews.intel.com>
jbromley@joshua.intel.com (James Bromley~) writes:

>>Robert, Dan's class of license (or that he even has one) is immaterial
>>to the discussion. And the issue isn't fairness of the current licensing
>>scheme, it is the relevance of it to present-day and future amateur
>>radio service requirements. Please address the matter at hand and
>>refrain from these thinly disguised, ad hominem attacks.

>Well, it becomes material and relevant when Dan makes it relevant, to wit:

>--BEGIN INCLUDED TEXT--

>

>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>From: ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
>Subject: Re: More on no-code
>Message-ID: <C6xM3H.9z8@ucdavis.edu>
>Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 20:54:52 GMT

>

>.

>It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you.
>Or that there are also extras who want to see the code requirement changed.

>.

>--END INCLUDED TEXT--

>

>Looks like a ringing contradiction to me.

>

>-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX

Oh. Right.

Dan, Your class of license (or that you even have one) is immaterial to the discussion. And the issue isn't fairness of the current licensing scheme, it is the relevance of it to present-day and future amateur radio service requirements. Please address the matter at hand and refrain from this thinly disguised self-congratulation.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #149
